8394

Thoughts on the Athanaſian Creed,

A

SERMON

PREACHED AT

STONY STRATFORD, APRIL 12, 1790,

AT THE

VISITATION

OF THE

REVEREND LUKE HESLOP, B.D.

ARCHDEACON OF BUCKS;

AND PUBLISHED

AT THE REQUEST OF THE CLERGY PRESENT.

By JOHN HEY, D.D.

RECTOR OF CALVERTON, BUCKS.

AND

NORRISIAN PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

CAMBRIDGE,

Printed by J. ARCHDEACON Printer to the UNIVERSITY;

For J. & J. MERRILL, in Cambridge; T. CADELL, in the Strand, B. WHITE & Son, in Fleetſtreet, T. PAYNE & Son, at the Mews Gate, R. FAULDER, in New Bondſtreet, G. & T. WILKIE, in St. Paul's Churchyard, and J. EVANS, in Paternoſter Row, London.

MDCCXC.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE Author, at the ſame time that he offers his acknowledgments to the Reverend the Archdeacon of Bucks, and the Clergy aſſembled at his viſitation, for their Indulgence with regard to the following diſcourſe; thinks it his Duty to acknowledge the candor and goodneſs of thoſe, to whom he has more fully diſcuſſed the ſame topics, in his Academical Lectures. It has been the occaſion of no common ſatisfaction to him, to ſee perſons of different ages, ſome of whom are themſelves engaged in the buſineſs of Inſtruction, unite patiently in attending to what he has offered in ſupport of Religion, and the peculiar tenets of our eſtabliſhment. Such a view, independent of the encouragement it gives to his own endeavours, is in itſelf highly intereſting, and raiſes hopes of a pleaſing and important kind.

4 OC 58

A SERMON, &c.

MARK xvi. 16.

HE THAT BELIEVETH AND IS BAPTIZED, SHALL BE SAVED; BUT HE THAT BELIEVETH NOT, SHALL BE DAMNED.

I HAVE choſen theſe words with the view of offering a few remarks on that compoſition, which is now generally called the *Athanaſian Creed*; a compoſition, which has been raſhly condemned, and for the uſe of which our Church has been unreaſonably cenſured.

The firſt objection uſually urged againſt it is, that it is a *deception* or impoſition with reſpect to the Author. I confeſs, I do not ſee in what ſenſe it can be called ſo. Many have *believed* it to be the work of Athanaſius,

perhaps without ſufficient reaſon; but no one can prove, that the *Author* of it publiſhed it as the work of that great Father; and I am not aware, that it was ever *impoſed* upon any ſet of Chriſtians as his work; or, that any were ever required to profeſs it to be his.

We are told, that only "the illiterate, or "the wrong-headed," would read this Creed from choice; * that "every Clergyman of the "leaſt knowledge or judgment muſt know" it "to be repugnant to the ſacred word of "God;" and, that "every candid and en-"lightened Clergyman" would own this, if he ſpoke his real ſentiments. Theſe are hard ſayings, and ſhould be well ſupported to be free from blame. They call upon every individual to ſpeak for himſelf. For my own part, I fully believe, that thoſe of the ſacred Order, who have favoured this Creed, have been as learned, enlightened, candid, and judicious, as thoſe who have oppoſed it—†.

As

* See a Pamphlet called *Hints*, &c. p. 31—35.

† In Dr. Waterland's Hiſtory of the Athanaſian Creed, Tables are made, from which one ſees immediately, what writers have conſidered it as the work of Athanaſius,—and from which one may eaſily collect who have favoured it. —— In the Copy belonging to Magdalen College, Cambridge, I find the following MS. note, in Biſhop Gibſon's hand;

"A *Swediſh* Miniſter aſſures me to day, that the Athana-"ſian Creed is read conſtantly in the publick ſervice on "*Rogation* and *Trinity* Sundays, and that all children are "obliged to get it by Heart.

"Whitehall, Jan. 21, 173$\frac{0}{1}$." Edm. London."

As to the aſſertion of its being known to be repugnant to the "word of God," the only pertinent queſtion is, whether thoſe know it to be ſo who give a full aſſent to the *Articles* of the Church of England? I declare publicly, that I do *not* know the Athanaſian Creed to be repugnant to the New Teſtament. There is no doubt, but that many of our diſſenting Brethren, men learned and eſtimable, think it ſo; but that is not to the purpoſe. A Creed is only a compilation of doctrines ſuppoſed to be already *proved*; it is uſed in any religious aſſembly, for the ſake of order and unity, and as an help to Devotion: He who has doubts relative to the *Doctrines* contained in it, has in reality no concern with it, conſidered as a part of a Liturgy. Two Creeds may differ widely in point of Doctrine, and yet both be compoſitions perfect in their kind.

I do not therefore mean, in what I would offer, to enter into any *proof* of the truth of the Doctrines ſtated in the Athanaſian Creed; for ſuch proof other opportunities are required; and indeed, ſuppoſing the doctrines incapable of proof, it would be in vain to ſet aſide the *Creed* on their account, unleſs we could ſet aſide our *Articles* alſo: — My purpoſe only is, to offer a few conſiderations tending to ſhew, that a perſon, who attends

the public offices of Religion as a member of the Church of England, or who is ready to ſubſcribe to the Articles of that Church, need not ſcruple the uſe of the Athanaſian Creed.

This compoſition may be conſidered as conſiſting of declarations of two ſorts;—declarations of *doctrines*, and declarations of *evil* in caſe ſome particular doctrines are not received. The former, as far as they differ from declarations in other Creeds, relate to the Doctrines of the *Trinity*, and the *Incarnation* of the Son of God.

It is a fundamental miſtake to ſuppoſe, that this Creed undertakes to *explain** theſe myſterious Doctrines: to me it ſeems to explain nothing, to attempt to explain nothing. It might perhaps, without much impropriety, be ſaid to *ſtate* the doctrines; though that could ſcarcely be ſaid with the utmoſt ſtrictneſs: what it does, in ſtrictneſs, is this: it *rejects* particular *errors*, actually prevailing at the time when it was written: errors inconſiſtent with the *Catholic Faith*;—that Faith, which was then generally profeſſed by the main Body of Chriſtians. When the Creed ſpeaks moſt affirmatively and particularly, I apprehend its true intent and meaning to be, the com-

* "The famous Creed which ſo clearly expounds the myſ-
" teries of the Trinity and the Incarnation, &c."
Gibbon's Hiſtory, Vol. 3. p. 544, quarto.

complete and effectual negation or removal of *error*: or keeping the catholic faith "*whole and undefiled.*" † — It does, indeed, ſeem to uſe one *illuſtration*; "as the reaſonable ſoul "and fleſh is one Man, ſo God and Man is "one Chriſt:" — but this can ſcarcely be called *explaining*: it is merely obſerving that, as we commonly believe the connexion between Body and Soul, which is allowed to be *inexplicable*, we cannot be juſtified in refuſing to admit the connexion of the divine and human natures in Chriſt, merely becauſe that connexion *cannot* be *explained*.

The errors rejected with regard to the Holy *Trinity*, are of two ſorts; the errors of thoſe who *confounded* the three Perſons; that is, took away all diſtinction between them; and the errors of thoſe who *divided* the ſubſtance, or Nature; that is, made three diſtinct Beings; either three original divine Beings, or three Beings differing in origin and rank. There does not ſeem to be a word ſaid concerning the Holy Trinity, except what is intended to reject ſome of theſe errors, and to

† This remark might be extended even to Bp. Pearſon's Expoſition of the Creed. He *ſeems* to ſtate and to explain; and to lay down things unintelligible as if he underſtood them; but the concluſion generally ſhews, that his view was, all the while, to obviate ſome particular *error*; Not one which only *might* exiſt, but one which *had* exiſted in the Chriſtian Church.

to prevent their being maintained by ſubterfuge or equivocation. We may not now, perhaps, be able to ſee all the ancient errors preciſely; but we may conceive, that thoſe, who took away all diſtinction between the Perſons, might ſubſtitute one Perſon for another; and ſo profeſs, or ſeem to profeſs, a belief in "three Sons," or "three Holy "Ghoſts;" and they would, of courſe, deny the Generation of the Son, and the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt: — whilſt thoſe, who divided the ſubſtance, or Nature, might make the Son and Holy Ghoſt inferior to Divinity; or hold, that there were "three Gods, "— or three Lords."

The errors rejected with reſpect to the *Incarnation* of the Son of God, are more numerous: and what wonder? If ſo ſtupendous an event be revealed, as the uniting of the Divine and Human Natures, all good and zealous Chriſtians muſt ſtudy it; and, being unable to comprehend it, muſt be expected to fall into a variety of opinions, or imaginations, concerning it. In a candid inveſtigation, each opinion will be taken up in order to avoid ſome great difficulty, or ſeeming abſurdity; and in this, there is nothing which can reaſonably give offence. What Chriſtian, actuated by the ſpirit of his Religion, will be offended with his Brother for avoiding

ing difficulty in a mode ſomewhat different from his own? Some Chriſtians, dreading the abſurdity of *Polytheiſm*, will not allow that "the Son of God is *God*;" and others, ſhocked at the thought that the Son of God ſhould partake of the evil and impurity of *matter*, have denied that he was "*Man*." And, as theſe laſt abhorred the idea that the fleſh of Chriſt could be "*human fleſh*," the *Apollinarians* denied that the *Soul* of Chriſt could be the human ſoul: 'Could Omniſcience,' they ſeem to have ſaid, 'acquire knowledge gra-'dually? or be impeded by doubt? no! the 'Logos, the Divine *Word*, muſt have been to 'Chriſt in the place of human reaſon, or of 'the "*reaſonable ſoul*" of Man.' — The *Neſtorian* might ſay, 'It is impoſſible for Man to '*do* things divine; it is impoſſible for God to '*ſuffer* things human: therefore Chriſt, who 'both did things divine, and ſuffered things 'human, muſt have been, properly, two 'agents or Perſons;' there muſt have been, in ſtrictneſs, "*two Chriſts*;" 'and we ought 'to ſay, the *Divine* Chriſt raiſed the dead; 'the *human* Chriſt ſlept and was "an hun-"gred." — The *Eutychian* pleaded poſſibly thus: 'What could finite Man, be when 'united to the infinite Supreme Being? loſt, 'abſorbed, annihilated! if any thing had, in 'effect, remained, it muſt have *debaſed* that

'Nature, which is incapable of debasement.
'The flesh, indeed, of Christ was real; but
'how? certainly by a "*conversion* of the God-
"head into Flesh;" for, by the union, all
'became divine; the divine and human na-
'tures must have been blended together, con-
'solidated, melted down into one, by a *fusion*,
'or "*confusion of substance*," or nature *.'

Whoever examines what is peculiar to the Athanasian Creed concerning the Incarnation of Christ, will find, that it does nothing more than reject these several errors. And what is more reasonable than that they should be publicly renounced by those who look upon them as defiling the Catholic Faith? It is not my present design to obviate any of them; they may be left, for the present, to obviate one another.

Let us now turn our attention to the declarations of *evil*, or, as they are sometimes called, the *condemning clauses*. These are of two sorts; some denounce evil against those who reject *Christianity*; others against those who

* The expression of the Creed, "*taking of the manhood into God*," may seem to approach near to the Eutychian notion, till we consider, that the natures, divine and human, are declared, in the creed, to remain *distinct* from each other, after the Incarnation. Probably, nothing more is meant by taking the manhood *into* God, than by Christ's taking human nature *upon* him. These two prepositions are not very different in their effect, when our knowledge is so imperfect. *Assumere*, and *suscipere*, are used on this occasion; but no words can convey an adequate idea.

who reject the particular doctrines of the *Creed*. With regard to the former, what do they more than the words of the Text, "He "that believeth not, ſhall be damned?" — But "ſome man may ſay," — 'this does not 'remove my difficulties; the Text itſelf is 'difficult.' Be it ſo; yet the Creed which is *ſcriptural*, is *perfect*. — But, not to inſiſt upon this, let us put ourſelves in the place of thoſe, to whom the Text was firſt addreſſed. Chriſt had given all his proofs of his divine miſſion; and now, about to aſcend to his heavenly Father, he charges his Diſciples to preach the Goſpel to all Nations; and adds, that Converts to it ſhould be ſaved, but thoſe who refuſed to be converted, ſhould be condemned. In ſuch a ſtate of things, there could be no *proof* given, becauſe there could be no *doubt*, of the truth of the Religion to be preached: and therefore the primitive meaning of the text muſt be this, — 'If a propoſal '*really* comes from Heaven, thoſe who re-'ceive it will find benefit; thoſe who reject 'it, muſt ſuffer, at leaſt the loſs of that be-'nefit, and probably poſitive puniſhment.' Nor can this laſt be deemed unreaſonable, as it is not to be queſtioned that God ſuits his evidence to our Faculties in ſuch a manner, that, generally ſpeaking, or when that evi-

dence

dence takes its free courſe, we *may* embrace what he propoſes.

Now ſuppoſe, after Chriſt's aſcenſion into Heaven, an *Apoſtle* to preach the Goſpel to an Heathen, and to tell him what our Lord had declared, repeating the Menace, "*He that believeth not, ſhall be damned*;"—the Heathen muſt ſee that, before it could be of any force, the Chriſtian Religion muſt be ſuppoſed to be *true*. The threat of a falſe prophet muſt be perfectly vain and inſignificant. Here again, therefore, the meaning only is, and only can be this;—that a meſſage or propoſal really ſent from Heaven, will be beneficial to thoſe who receive it, and will occaſion evil to thoſe who reject it. And ſurely, if the Chriſtian Religion be *true*, receiving it or not cannot be a matter of indifference; would Chriſt have died to ſupport a ſyſtem, and would the Prophets have prepared men for it from the beginning of the world, if at laſt it might be careleſſly rejected with impunity?

Let us now take the ſecond ſort of condemning clauſes; thoſe which denounce evil on all who reject the particular doctrines of the *Creed*. The caſe here ſeems to be preciſely the ſame as before; as the Apoſtle warns the Heathen, ſo the orthodox preacher warns

warns the Heretic; but all who preach not the *truth*, muſt warn and threaten in vain: therefore no threatening clauſe can have weight, or meaning, but on ſuppoſition of its enforcing true doctrines. Nothing is more clear, than that we ſhall not be puniſhed for rejecting falſhood: and yet, clear as this is, it is all that is wanting to make us eaſy about all condemning clauſes whatſoever.

But it may be urged, 'If this reaſoning 'makes condemning clauſes harmleſs, does 'it not, at the ſame time, prove them to be '*uſeleſs?*' I apprehend *not*. When a ſyſtem of *true* doctrines is propoſed, there are many things which may hinder it from being accepted; paſſion, intereſt, prejudice, caprice, &c. If the mind is left under the dominion of theſe, the moſt pure and perfect truths may be preached in vain: the attention therefore is to be rouſed, worldly paſſions counteracted by impreſſions of a forcible kind; the word muſt be made "*quick** *and* "*powerful, ſharper than any two-edged ſword.*" Nothing can be more ſeaſonable, on propoſing a ſet of doctrines, than a warning to this effect; 'Take good care how you re-'fuſe, or through paſſion or intereſt neglect, 'what may be divine truth! be aſſured, that 'whatever really is ſo, will be accompanied 'with

* Heb. iv. 12.

' with important bleſſings; and the refuſal of ' it, with important evils!'

Perhaps it may be ſaid, that, if denunciations of the kind we ſpeak of are neceſſary, they ſhould at leaſt be made perfectly clear, by having their *limitations expreſſed*. But this would be *unnatural*, *needleſs*, and in ſome reſpects *hurtful*: *unnatural*, becauſe every man is fully perſuaded of the truth of his own Syſtem, and deeply impreſſed with a ſenſe of its importance; and it would be very irkſome to him, while he is warmed in explaining and defending it, to ſuppoſe the poſſibility of its falſhood; — *needleſs*, becauſe nothing can be more obvious, than that no man will be puniſhed for rejecting what is not true; *hurtful*, becauſe to deliver a moral or pious exhortation with doubts, diſtinctions, and heſitations, would be to damp its ardor, and to weaken its efficacy*.

As what I have offered removes every conſiderable difficulty, reſpecting the Athanaſian Creed, from my own mind, I might truſt to its affecting others in like manner; yet a few *additional* obſervations may poſſibly have their uſe.

1. Uneaſineſs ſeems ſometimes to ariſe particularly

* See the opening of Dr. Ogden's 5th Sermon on the Commandments; which will ſerve to explain the expreſſion, "*before all things* it is neceſſary," &c.

ticularly from thoſe doctrines being ſtrongly preſſed, which are myſterious, or *incomprehenſible*. But it ſhould be obſerved, that a propoſition may be intelligible, taken in a negative ſenſe, as rejecting an error, though, in its affirmative ſenſe, it may contain a doctrine which is above human comprehenſion. When I uſe the words "*God of God*," as affirming the eternal generation of the Son of God, the thing is what I cannot comprehend; but, when I ſay, 'the Son of God 'was begotten from everlaſting,' meaning thereby only to *deny* that any one can aſſign a time when the Son of God did *not* exiſt, I ſeem to underſtand what I ſay. Nor is this peculiar to revealed religion; if I ſay, affirmatively, 'God exiſts from Eternity,' I am loſt in the thought; — but, if I ſpeak only as denying that any time can be mentioned when there was no God, I ſeem to have a diſtinct conception. Now, if the doctrinal propoſitions of the Athanaſian Creed are only ſo many negations of error, they may be intelligible in the ſame manner. — It ſhould alſo be remembered, on this head, for the comfort of the feeble-minded *, that the aſſent given to incomprehenſible doctrines, amidſt the diſcordant arguments of contending ſects, muſt needs be of a much *fainter* kind

* 1 Theſſ. v. 14.

kind than that which we give when we have clear and diſtinct ideas.

2. In the condemning clauſes of our Creed, and the words of my text on which they are founded, it may be obſerved, that the words *ſaved* and *damned* do not mark out any one preciſe *degree* of happineſs and miſery, but admit of a great variety of degrees, according to the will of God in different circumſtances. Nay, condemnation may, in ſome caſes, be everlaſting, and yet not be very grievous; as in the caſe of a fine of ſmall value. Nevertheleſs, Prudence will always be careful to conceive too high a degree of good and evil, in ſalvation and damnation, rather than one too low, when the buſineſs is to ſettle motives to right conduct.

3. The words of the Text muſt be made conſiſtent with other parts of Scripture; particularly with thoſe, which forbid us to *judge*. It is written, "He that believeth not, ſhall "be damned;" but it is alſo written, — "judge not" — "who art thou that judgeſt "another?" — and ſo on. No one, therefore, has a right to apply the Text, or the threatening clauſes of the Creed, to any particular *caſe*; not even, in all ways, as I conceive, to his *own*. A miniſter may reaſonably

ably ſay, 'Take good care, leſt you reject 'truth:' a private man may ſay, 'It behoves 'me to be extremely cautious how I refuſe 'what may be a propoſal from Heaven:' But no man has a right to ſay, that any particular perſon ſtands actually condemned in the ſight of God, merely for the fact of having rejected a particular ſyſtem of Doctrines.

4. God is the only Judge in the caſe of each *individual*. "To his own* Maſter" every one "ſtandeth or falleth." God is the "One Lawgiver, who is able to ſave † and "to deſtroy." For wiſe purpoſes, he makes a *general* denunciation againſt Infidelity; but he does not thereby deprive himſelf of that power of *remiſſion* in extraordinary caſes, the exerciſe of which, in any Judge, muſt be extenſive, in proportion to the knowledge which he has of particular circumſtances. If, therefore, *extraordinary caſes* are propoſed, for the ſake of perplexing ordinary reaſonings, the anſwer is, we leave extraordinary caſes to the judgment of the Supreme Being.

And now, what is the *reſult* of this reaſoning? ſhall the Athanaſian Creed be retained, or ſhall it be expunged from our Liturgy? I beg leave to declare that, on my own

* Rom. xiv. 4. † James iv. 12.

own account, I have not any objection to its being retained. Others may be leſs ſatiſfied; yet I ſhould hope, that thoſe members of the Church of *England*, who would take the trouble to conſider the ſubject, might *obtain* ſatisfaction. The reaſonings uſed in this diſcourſe might contribute towards this end; they do not appear as if they would be above the comprehenſion of an ordinary capacity, ſuppoſing them to be expreſſed more fully, and in plain and popular language.—

With regard to *Doctrine*; if the Doctrine of the Church of England is to be *changed*, this Creed muſt undoubtedly be ſet aſide. But, if that Doctrine is to be continued, ſuch a meaſure ſeems highly imprudent. Of this we may judge by the earneſtneſs of thoſe to get rid of the Creed, who favor a change in the eſtabliſhed notions: for what reaſon are they ſo particularly deſirous of removing it out of the way, but becauſe they find it an unſurmountable obſtacle to their deſigns?

On ſome points in it, our Church has not now any Controverſy; and ſome ſentences are obſcure on that account. But we are always *liable* to be called into Controverſy even on theſe. The *Eutychian* errors make the moſt difficult part of the Creed; but theſe were revived* at the time of our Refor-

* By the Anabaptiſts.

formation, and perſiſted in even unto Death*. The *Apollinarian* Hereſy has been revived in the preſent Century, by a countryman of our own, very eminent in Science †. And whenever revolutions, or other occaſions, ſet men upon making religious ſyſtems for themſelves, the ſame cauſes will produce the ſame effects. Thoſe who ſuffer fortifications to fall to ruin in time of Peace, tempt their enemies to attack them; and then in vain do they endeavour, in the midſt of confuſion, to form a new Bulwark equal in ſtrength to the old.

With regard to retaining the *condemning clauſes*, were change perfectly eaſy, it might, perhaps, be recommended to uſe only the words of the Text, as a ſolemn warning; and to inſert them, after the manner of a Doxology, inſtead of each threatening of the Creed. A denunciation againſt "an evil "heart of unbelief," made in the words of our Lord, inſtead of thoſe of human compoſition, muſt add to the Solemnity of the Office, at the ſame time that it leſſened the difficulties of the ſcrupulous ‡. But, as

* See the affecting Story of Joan Bocher, in Mr. Hume's Hiſtory, A. D. 1549.

† Mr. Whiſton, Profeſſor of Mathematics at Cambridge.

‡ The effect of this ſubſtitution will beſt appear to him who ſhall actually make it. — I would have Mark xvi. 16. ſubſtituted for the firſt and ſecond ſentences of the Creed; alſo inſtead

change is by no means eaſy, reflexions ſuch as the preſent, might make men agree to retain the clauſes as they now ſtand. For they can only be of force on ſuppoſition of their being annexed to divine Truth; and to that mens attention is to be awakened by ſtrong warnings, and earneſt exhortations. Certainly, warnings, whether in divine or human words, ought not to diſcourage *freedom of enquiry:* we ought to "prove all "things," however we may be preſſed: he who ſuffers himſelf to be threatened into the reception of error, incapacitates himſelf for receiving the truth.

To conclude. The compoſition which we have been conſidering, call it a Creed or what you pleaſe, has undoubtedly been much *admired* in many parts of the Chriſtian world: not becauſe it attempted to *explain* things inexplicable; not becauſe it contained any thing new: but becauſe it rejected prevailing errors in a clear and orderly way; in expreſſions ſo meaſured as to pleaſe the ear; in terms ſo preciſe as to diſappoint all that evaſion, to which Hereſy has been too apt to have

ſtead of the words, "He therefore that will be ſaved, muſt "thus think of the Trinity;"—and, laſtly, inſtead of the concluding ſentence.—As the Creed is ſometimes ſung, and has been frequently called a *Pſalm*, the verſe (Mark xvi. 16.) has been lately ſet to a kind of Chant, by way of trial; the word "*condemned*" being uſed in the place of the word "*damned.*"

have recourſe. Its enemies have repreſented it as borrowing or ſtealing credit from the name of *Athanaſius*; not recollecting, that the Creeds or confeſſions of Faith undoubtedly his, never arrived to the ſame degree of celebrity with that of which we have been ſpeaking. For my own part, I do not ſee why it may not be again admired, if men learn to view it in that light in which it is both uſeful and intelligible. Till that happens, it will occaſion perpetual controverſy; and, while we are involved in controverſy, we can admire nothing: the emotions of the heart will never ſpring forth freely, while the head is either heated with diſpute and contention, or embarraſſed with doubt and perplexity.

have recourse. His enemies have represented it as borrowing or stealing credit from the name of Athanasius; not recollecting, that the Creeds or confessions of Faith undoubtedly He never arrived to the same degree of celebrity with that of which we have been speaking. For my own part, I do not see why it may not be again admired, if men learn to view it in that light in which it is both useful and intelligible. Till that happens, it will occasion perpetual controversy; and, while we are involved in controversy, we can admire nothing: the emotions of the heart will never [illegible] forth freely, while the mind is either heated with dispute and contention, or embarrassed with doubt and perplexity.

4 OC 58